APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,543	02/20/2004	Stephen Cutler	CUTCP0103US	7433

23908   7590   11/20/2008
RENNER OTTO BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP
1621 EUCLID AVENUE
NINETEENTH FLOOR
CLEVELAND, OH 44115

EXAMINER
ORR, HENRY W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/20/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 August 2008*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12-14,16-28,35-46,48-50,52-64,71 and 72* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-10, 12-14, 16-28, 35-46, 48-50, 52-64 and 71-72* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a) ☐ All　b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
　　　　　application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to applicant's amendment dated 8/19/2008.

2.   Claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-28, 35-46, 48-50, 52-64 and 71-72 are pending in the

case.

3.   Claims 11, 15, 29-34, 47, 51 and 65-70 are cancelled.

4.   Claims 1 and 37 are independent claims.

Applicant's Response

5.   In Applicant's response dated 8/19/2008, applicant has amended the following:

       a) Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 12-14, 16-23, 25-27, 35-42, 44, 46, 48-50, 52-59, 61-63, 71

and 72.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 12, 13, 18-24, 35-38, 42-45, 48, 49, 54-60 and 70-72 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Czerwinski et al.

(hereinafter "Czerwinski"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0066414 A1 in view of

Duffy, European Patent Application No. 613 080 A2.

Claim 1:

Czerwinski teaches a computer application workspace generation and navigation tool embodied on a computer-readable medium, comprising code that generates a logical application workspace defined by an associated main computer application, the logical application workspace comprised of a plurality of logical screens (see par. 3, par. 8, par. 24, par. 35).

Czerwinski fails to expressly teach comprising code that generates a logical application workspace **that is larger than a physically viewable work area** defined by an associated main computer application, the logical application workspace comprised of a plurality of logical screens, wherein: each logical screen has dimensions that are generally coextensive with the physically viewable work area defined by the main computer application; and **the screens are arranged contiguously such that the application workspace is a single and functionally continuous logical workspace that is larger in size than a physical monitor used to display the physically viewable work area.** (emphasis added)

However, Duffy teaches a logical application workspace that is larger than a physically viewable work area defined by an associated main computer application, the logical application workspace comprised of a plurality of logical screens, wherein: each logical screen has dimensions that are generally coextensive with the physically viewable work area defined by the main computer application; and the screens are arranged contiguously such that the application workspace is a single and functionally continuous logical workspace that is larger in size than a physical monitor used to display the physically viewable work area (see abstract, Figures 2-11c).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the workspace as taught by Czerwinski to have a "real" and "virtual" workspace as taught by Duffy to provide the benefit of unlimited space to operate with application windows (see Duffy; p. 2 lines 2-24).

Claim 2:

Czerwinski teaches **code that logically associates a plurality of sub-application windows with respective locations of within the logical application workspace, the sub-application windows for displaying content of at least one open sub-application** (see par. 36, par. 39).

Claim 6:

Czerwinski teaches **code that stores an arrangement of sub-application windows disposed within the logical application workspace** (see abstract, par. 46, Figure 8).

Claim 7:

Czerwinski teaches **code that retrieves the stored arrangement of sub-application windows** (see abstract, par. 46, Figure 8).

Claim 8:

Czerwinski teaches **code that stores a layout of the logical application workspace including a number and arrangement of screens and relative location of each sub-application window** (see abstract, par. 35, par. 46).

Claim 9:

Czerwinski teaches **code that retrieves the stored layout** (see abstract, par. 35, par. 46).

Claim 11: (cancelled)

Claim 12:

Czerwinski teaches **code that, upon initiation of one of the sub-application windows, logically associates the sub-application window with a location within the logical application workspace identified by user action** (see par. 39).

Claim 13:

Czerwinski teaches **code to provide the user with a user moveable placement means, wherein the location within the logical application workspace identified by user action corresponds to a location of the placement means**

relative to the application workspace (see par. 46).

Claim 15: (cancelled)

Claim 18:

Czerwinski teaches **code that generates a navigation box** (e.g. preview screen) **that includes a representation of each logical screen** (see par. 35, par. 46)**.**

Claim 19:

Czerwinski teaches **wherein the logical screen representations are arranged to have a topography corresponding to a topography of the logical screens** (see par. 35, par. 46)**.**

Claim 20:

Czerwinski teaches **code that, in response to user selection of one of the screen representations in the navigation box, displays the corresponding screen in the physically viewable work area defined by the main computer application** (see par. 35, par. 41-42, par. 46).

Claim 21:

Czerwinski teaches **code that logically associates a plurality of sub-application windows with respective locations within the logical application workspace, the sub-application windows for displaying content of at least one sub-application** (see par. 36, par. 39).

Claim 22:

Czerwinski teaches **code that logically associates each sub-application window with a logical screen in which a majority of the sub-application window is disposed and code that displays a representation of each sub-application window in association with the representation of the logically associated screen** (see par. 35-36, par. 39).

Claim 23:

Czerwinski teaches **code that moves a user selected sub-application window from a logically associated screen to another logical screen in response to user initiated movement of the corresponding representation of the sub-application window in the navigation box** (see par. 35, par. 46).

Claim 24:

Czerwinski teaches **code that displays information relating to one of the sub-application windows in response to user action in connection with the representation of the one of the sub-application windows in the navigation box application** (see par. 41-42, par. 46).

Claims 29-34: (cancelled)

Claim 35:

Czerwinski teaches **wherein the placement means is a placement pointer having a position that defines the location within the logical workspace identified by user action** (see par. 46-47).

Claim 36:

Czerwinski teaches **wherein the placement means is a placement tool for marking the location within the logical workspace identified by user action** (see par. 46-47).

Claims 37 and 38:

Claims 37 and 38 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in manufacture claims 1 and 2 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected under the same rationale as manufacture claims 1 and 2 above.

Claims 42 and 43:

Claims 42 and 43 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in manufacture claims 6 and 7 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected under the same rationale as manufacture claims 6 and 7 above.

Claims 44 and 45:

Claims 44 and 45 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in manufacture claims 8 and 9 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected under the same rationale as manufacture claims 8 and 9 above.

Claim 47: (cancelled)

Claims 48 and 49:

Claims 48 and 49 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in
manufacture claims 12 and 13 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected
under the same rationale as manufacture claims 12 and 13 above.

Claim 51: (cancelled)

Claim 54:

Claim 54 is a method claim and is substantially encompassed in manufacture
claim 18; therefore the method claim is rejected under the same rationale as
manufacture claim 18 above.

Claim 55:

Claim 55 is a method claim and is substantially encompassed in manufacture
claim 19; therefore the method claim is rejected under the same rationale as
manufacture claim 19 above.

Claim 56:

Claim 56 is a method claim and is substantially encompassed in manufacture
claim 20; therefore the method claim is rejected under the same rationale as
manufacture claim 20 above.

Claims 57-60:

Claims 57-60 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in manufacture claims 21-24 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected under the same rationale as manufacture claims 21-24 above.

Claims 65-70: (cancelled)

Claims 71 and 72:

Claims 71 and 72 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in manufacture claims 35 and 36 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected under the same rationale as manufacture claims 35 and 36 above.

8.   **Claims 1-5, 10, 14, 16, 17, 25-28, 37-41, 46, 50, 52, 53 and 61-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (hereinafter "Anderson"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0189597 A1 in view of Duffy, European Patent Application No. 613 080 A2.**

Claim 1:

Anderson teaches a computer application workspace generation and navigation tool embodied on a computer-readable medium, comprising code that generates a

logical application workspace defined by an associated main computer application, the logical application workspace comprised of a plurality of logical screens (see abstract, par. 3, par. 8-9, Figures 2 and 5).

Anderson fails to expressly teach comprising code that generates a logical application workspace **that is larger than a physically viewable work area** defined by an associated main computer application, the logical application workspace comprised of a plurality of logical screens, wherein: each logical screen has dimensions that are generally coextensive with the physically viewable work area defined by the main computer application; and **the screens are arranged contiguously such that the application workspace is a single and functionally continuous logical workspace that is larger in size than a physical monitor used to display the physically viewable work area.** (emphasis added)

However, Duffy teaches a logical application workspace that is larger than a physically viewable work area defined by an associated main computer application, the logical application workspace comprised of a plurality of logical screens, wherein: each logical screen has dimensions that are generally coextensive with the physically viewable work area defined by the main computer application; and the screens are arranged contiguously such that the application workspace is a single and functionally continuous logical workspace that is larger in size than a physical monitor used to display the physically viewable work area (see abstract, Figures 2-11c).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the workspace as taught by Anderson to have a "real"

and "virtual" workspace as taught by Duffy to provide the benefit of unlimited space to

operate with application windows (see Duffy; p. 2 lines 2-24).

Claim 2:

Anderson teaches **code that logically associates a plurality of sub-
application windows with respective locations within the logical application
workspace, the sub-application windows for displaying content of at least one
sub-application** (see abstract, par. 3, par. 8-9)**.**

Claim 3:

Anderson teaches **code that increases the number of screens if, by user
action, one of the sub-application windows is moved to a new location outside
the current dimensions of the logical application workspace** (see par. 35).

Claim 4:

Anderson teaches **code that increases the number of logical screens adds
screens in a number that is in excess of that needed to accommodate the new
location of the sub-application window** (see par. 34).

Claim 5:

     Anderson teaches **code that logically associates each sub-application window with a logical screen in which a majority of the sub-application window is disposed** (see par. 40).

Claim 10:

     Anderson teaches **code that scales the application workspace and sub-application windows to zoom the application workspace in or out** (see par. 8).

Claim 11: (cancelled)

Claim 14:

     Anderson teaches **wherein the logical screens are contiguously arranged in a matrix** (see par. 40, Figure 7).

Claim 15: (cancelled)

Claim 16:

     Anderson teaches **code that increases the number of logical screens and a corresponding dimension of the logical application workspace in accordance with a user action** (see par. 35).

Claim 17:

Anderson teaches **code that decreases the number of logical screens and a corresponding dimension of the logical application workspace in accordance with a user action** (see par. 10, par. 36).

Claim 25:

Anderson teaches **code that provides a drop down menu from which a user can select one of the plurality of logical screens for display in the physically viewable work area defined by the main computer application** (see par. 33). Examiner interprets the taskbar to anticipate the drop down menu because taskbar is capable of performing the limitations of the drop down menu as recited in claim 25.

Claim 26:

Anderson teaches **code that generates the logical application workspace generates a plurality of logical application workspaces for the main computer application** (see abstract).

Claim 27:

Anderson teaches **wherein each logical screen is associated with a unique identifying feature** (see par. 10).

Claim 28

Anderson teaches **wherein the unique identifying feature is selected from a background color, a background pattern and a combination thereof** (see par. 10).

Claims 37 and 38:

Claims 37 and 38 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in manufacture claims 1 and 2 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected under the same rationale as manufacture claims 1 and 2 above.

Claims 39 and 40:

Claims 39 and 40 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in manufacture claims 3 and 4 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected under the same rationale as manufacture claims 3 and 4 above.

Claim 41:

Claim 41 is a method claim and is substantially encompassed in manufacture claim 5; therefore the method claim is rejected under the same rationale as manufacture claim 5 above.

Claims 46:

Claim 46 is method claim and is substantially encompassed in manufacture claim 9; therefore the method claim is rejected under the same rationale as manufacture claim 9 above.

Claim 47: (cancelled)

Claim 51: (cancelled)

Claims 50, 52 and 53:

Claims 50, 52 and 53 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in manufacture claims 14, 16 and 17 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected under the same rationale as manufacture claims 14, 16 and 17 above.

Claims 61-64:

Claims 61-64 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in manufacture claims 25-28 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected under the same rationale as manufacture claims 25-28 above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-28, 35-46, 48-50, 52-64 and 71-72 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry Orr whose telephone number is (571) 270 1308. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8 to 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on (571) 272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

11/10/2008
HO

/Rachna Desai/
Primary Examiner, AU 2176